

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 25-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over the French '182 patent in combination with either Borroni or Eichman. Claim 4 has been rejected to under §103 as being obvious over the French '182 patent, and either Borroni or Eichman, and further in view of Kiefer. Claims 9, 12-17, 20, 23, 24, 29 and 30 have been deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims, as amended.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the limitations from allowable claim 24. Accordingly, claim 21, and the claims depending therefrom, are in proper form for allowance.

Independent claim 1, which has not been amended, requires a detergent dispenser for a clothes washing machine comprising a base, a first detergent cup for powder detergent, and a second detergent cup for liquid detergent, with the second cup being removably mounted in the first cup. The Examiner cites the French '182 patent as having a powder detergent cup with a removable liquid detergent cup mounted therein. The Examiner acknowledges that the French '182 patent does not have a base, as required by claim 1, but cites either the Borroni or the Eichman patents with such a base. The Examiner suggests that the motivation for combining Borroni or Eichman with the French '182 patent is to positively direct the detergent into the wash tub via the Borroni or Eichman base. However, even absent a base element, as required by claim 1, the French '182 patent inherently must direct the detergent into the tub. Since the French '182 patent necessarily directs the detergent into the tub, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited references that the French patent needs to be modified with the base of either Borroni or Eichman to direct or drain the detergent into the tub. Thus, the Examiner's alleged motivation or


purpose for combining Borroni or Eichman with the French patent is unsupported by any clear and objective teaching of the prior art, as required for a proper §103 rejection. See In re Fitch, 972 F. 2d 1260, 1265 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Dembiczak, 175 F. 3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Therefore, the §103 rejection of independent claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



KIRK M. HARTUNG, Reg. No. 31,021  
McKee, Voorhees & Sease, P.L.C.  
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721  
Phone No: (515) 288-3667  
Fax No: (515) 288-1338  
**CUSTOMER NO: 27139**

Attorneys of Record

-mlw-